UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,238	09/24/2004	Johan Agnes Emile Wouters	BE 020006	1781
24737 7590 02/18/2009 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001			EXAMINER	
			BROWN, VERNAL U	
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2612	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/18/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary	10/509,238	WOUTERS, JOHAN AGNES EMILE				
Office Action Gammary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	VERNAL U. BROWN	2612				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	Lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 No.	<u>ovember 2008</u> .					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1-18,21 and 22 is/are pending in the at 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-18,21 and 22 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers	r election requirement.					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)	a.□	(770.440)				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	ite				

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communication filed on November 7, 2008.

Response to Amendment

The examiner acknowledges the amendment of claims 1, 6, 10-13, 16, 18, and the addition of claims 21-22.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim1-18, 21-22 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Portion of pages 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, and 10 is not legible. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes et al. US Patent 5614906 in view of Schein et al. US Patent 6133909.

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claims 1-2, 16, Hayes et al. teaches a selector for linking code set to an object key in order to enable a user to control functions of a device by placing the remote control into a set up mode and allowing the user to select a command set and the selected command set is assigned to the actuated key (col. 4 line 50-col. 5 line 17). Hayes also teaches the coded set (command set) is chosen from a plurality of code sets for a given device (col. 5 lines 6-12). Hayes teaches the plurality of command sets (code sets) include a plurality of command codes for controlling a controllable device and teaches creating link between the preset code provided for a given device and the object key of the remote near control (col. 6 lines 6-44, col. 6 lines 59-64). Hayes et al. teaches downloading the codes from an external source to the remote control and the examiner considers the external source as a third party (col. 2 line 66-col. 3 line 5). Hayes et al. is not explicit in teaching the remote control code is IR or RF. Schein et al. in an analogous art teaches the use of RF and IR code in a remote control (figure 1) and this represent a conventional practice.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use IR or RF signal in the remote control because this represent a conventional practice.

Regarding claim 3, Hayes et al. teaches the remote control is a multi-mode device (col. 4 lines 50-56).

Regarding claims 4, 11, and 17, Hayes et al. teaches proposing a preset code set by performing a code set search based on a search criteria and presenting a code set base on the search criteria (col. 5 lines 7-11)

Regarding claim 5, Hayes teaches verifying the effect of linking the code to the key by observing the effect of operating the key (col. 6 lines 20-30).

Page 4

Regarding claims 6, 12, and 18, Hayes et al. teaches changing the order of the propose code set based on a previously selected code set (col. 6 lines 38-50).

Regarding claims 7 and 13, Hayes et al. teaches communicating unlink object key by observing if there is any effect upon pressing the key (col. 5 lines 17-20).

Regarding claims 9 and 14-15, Hayes et al. teaches the remote control include storage for storing downloaded code received from outside of the remote control device (col. 5 lines 40-48).

Regarding claim 10, Claim 10 recites a method for practicing the device of claim 1 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes et al. US Patent 5614906 in view of Schein et al. US Patent 6133909 and further in view of Lin et al. US Patent Application 20010017615.

Regarding claim 8, Hayes et al. is silent on teaching a touch screen input. Lin et al. in an analogous art teaches a remote control that uses a touch screen as an input means (paragraph 035).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the remote control of Hayes et al. as disclosed by Lin et al. because the touch screen renders the remote control to be more user friendly.

Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes et al. US Patent 5614906 in view of Schein et al. US Patent 6133909 and further in view of Frank US Patent 5457478.

Regarding claims 21-22, Hayes et al. is silent on teaching the prompting of the user to repeat a selection. Frank in an analogous art teaches the prompting of the user for making a selection.(col. 5 lines 1-6)..

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the user to prompt the user for making a selection because this rendered the device more users friendly and assist the user in determining the next step in linking a code set to a key.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VERNAL U. BROWN whose telephone number is (571)272-3060. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-7:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Zimmerman can be reached on 571-272-3059. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/509,238 Page 6

Art Unit: 2612

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Vernal U Brown/ Examiner, Art Unit 2612